UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,163	01/30/2004	Manuel Eslick Plaza	6015P2687	7765

23504   7590   11/01/2007

WEISS & MOY PC
4204 NORTH BROWN AVENUE
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/769,163	PLAZA, MANUEL ESLICK
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Le Nguyen ·	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 August 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) · Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 8/20/07.

2.   Claims 1-32 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 12 and 23 are

independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27 have been amended. This action is

made Final.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18-20, 23, 24, 26 and 28-31 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with*

HTML 4 in a Week ("HTML") in view of Bates et al. ("Bates"), and further in view of

Hartsman et al. ("Hartsman").

As per claim 1, although HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising detecting user activity

within a main browser window of said browser, parsing the detected activity to

determine a target of said detected activity to activate a secondary browser window and

display content associated with the target in the secondary browser window (pages 94

and 356; *following the detected user clicking of a hyperlink, detecting a tag for activating*

a secondary browser window and displaying content associated with the target in the

secondary browser window via parsing), HTML does not explicitly disclose comparing

the target to determine whether the target is in a list of pre-selected targets to displaying

content associated with the target in the browser window. Bates teaches comparing the

target to determine whether the target is in a list of pre-selected targets to displaying

content associated with the target in the browser window (paragraphs [0129]-[0131]). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the

method of Bates with the method of HTML given that it may be desirable to view only

sanctioned sites. HTML and Bates still do not explicitly disclose providing supplemental

content that differs from ordinary content specified by the target, i.e. a response and

information is supplied. Hartman teaches providing supplemental content that differs

from ordinary content specified by the target (paragraph [0015]). It would have been

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hartman

with the method of HTML and Bates in order to provide users with associated

information that may be of interest to users.

As per claim 2, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising a second detecting

wherein the second detecting is of a second user activity within the secondary browser

window and responsive to the second detecting, transferring a locator associated with

the second user activity to the primary browser window, whereby content associated

with the second user activity is displayed in the primary browser window (HTML: pages

338 and 356; *i.e. by using the TARGET attribute specifying the name of the primary*

browser window in order to display content associated with the second user activity in

the primary browser window wherein a second detection is made upon user's selection

of another link).

As per claim 4, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the detecting further

detects an active locator of the primary browser window and wherein the parsing

determines the target from the user activity and the active locator (HTML: pages 338

and 356; *in order to display a URL content in the specified window, the HTML code is*

parsed whereby the target/specified window where content is to be displayed and the

activated universal resource locater are detected).

As per claim 6, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the target is a link

containing a next locator for the primary browser window, and further comprising

blocking the primary browser window from activating the next locator in response to a

result of the comparing (Bates: paragraph [0131]).

As per claim 7, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the target is a link

containing a next locator for the primary browser window, and wherein the displaying

displays content associated with the next locator (HTML: pages 338 and 356; Bates: fig.

23; *content is displayed for each locator).*

As per claims 8 and 9, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a

browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising transmitting a

result of the comparing to a server and pushing content from the server in response to

reception of said result of the comparing wherein the displaying displays the pushed content and transmitting a result of the parsing to a server and pushing content from the server in response to reception of said result of the parsing wherein the displaying displays the pushed content (HTML: pages 338 and 356; Bates: fig. 23; paragraph [0080]; *i.e. described are standard Web browser interactions with a remote Web server*).

Claims 12 and 23 individually are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13 and 24 individually are similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15 and 26 individually are similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17 and 28 individually are similar in scope to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 29 individually are similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 19 and 20, in combination, are similar to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 30 and 31, in combination, are similar to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5.   Claims 3, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") in view of Bates

et al. ("Bates") and Hartsman et al. ("Hartsman") as applied to claims 2, 13 and 24, and

further in view of Best et al. ("Best").

As per claim 3, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a

browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising in response to

detecting a second user activity corresponding to a second target for which all

responsive content is targeted for display in the primary browser window (HTML: pages

338 and 356; *i.e. by using the TARGET attribute specifying the name of the primary

browser window in order to display content associated with the second user activity in

the primary browser window*) and hiding the secondary browser window in response to

having detected a user activity (HTML: figs. 12.1 and 12.15; Bates: fig. 23; *via selection

of close "X" icon located in upper right hand corner of each frame/window*), the modified

HTML does not explicitly disclose hiding a window in response to having detected a

user activity corresponding to a target for which all responsive content is targeted for

display in a browser window. Best teaches hiding a window in response to having

detected a user activity corresponding to a target for which all responsive content is

targeted for display in a browser window (paragraphs [0033]-[0034]; *upon selection of

URL 405 in window 431, window 431 closes and all responsive content is displayed in a

browser as indicated in block 531*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time

of the invention to incorporate the method of Best with the method of the modified

HTML in order to emphasize the area of focus and provide a less cluttered viewing

area.

Claims 14 and 25 individually are similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore

rejected under similar rationale.

6.   Claims 5, 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") in view of Bates

et al. ("Bates") and Hartsman et al. ("Hartsman") as applied to claims 4, 15 and 26, and

further in view of Vance, Jr. et al. ("Vance").

As per claim 5, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a

browser executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the active locator

is a universal resource locator, the user activity comprises selection of the URL wherein

the target is the content associated with the URL and wherein the displaying displays

supplemental content associated with the URL (HTML: figs. 12.1 and 12.15; pages 338

and 356; Bates: fig. 23), the modified HTML does not explicitly disclose the locater to be

a search engine, a user activity comprising entry of a search engine key wherein the

user activity is parsed to determine a target of the detected activity wherein the target is

a search engine result of the search engine for the search engine key whereby content

associated with the search engine key is displayed. Vance teaches a locater to be a

search engine, a user activity comprising entry of a search engine key wherein the user

activity is parsed to determine a target of the detected activity wherein the target is a

search engine result of the search engine for the search engine key whereby content

associated with the search engine key is displayed (col. 2, lines 53-56; col. 3, lines 42-

47; *the locator is a search engine key/search key entered in a search engine or search*

field wherein user activity is parsed to determine a target or search result for the search

engine key for display of content associated with the search key). It would have been

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Vance

with the method of the modified HTML in order to find a particular topic of interest

among the vast resources available over the Internet and save time.   ·

Claims 16 and 27 individually are similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore

rejected under similar rationale.

7.   Claims 10, 11, 21, 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") in

view of Bates et al. ("Bates") and Hartsman et al. ("Hartsman"), and further in view of

Ryan et al. ("Ryan").

As per claim 10, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a

browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising a second

detecting wherein the second detecting is of a second user activity within the secondary

browser window and responsive to the second detecting, transferring a locator

associated with the second user activity to the primary browser window and wherein the

displaying displays content associated with the target in the secondary browser window

(HTML: pages 338 and 356; *i.e. a second detection is made upon user's*

activity/selection of another link and using the TARGET attribute specifies the name of

the browser window wherein content associated with the second user selection is to be

displayed), the modified HTML does not explicitly disclose a second detecting wherein

the second detecting is of a geographical location associated with a user of the general-

purpose computer system and wherein the displaying displays content filtered by the

geographical location. Ryan teaches a second detecting wherein the second detecting

is of a geographical location associated with a user of the general-purpose computer

system (fig. 12(A); paragraph [0097]; *users are prompted to enter a zip code or city*),

and wherein the displaying displays content associated with the target and filtered by

the geographical location in a secondary window (figs. 12(A-B); paragraphs [0108],

[0072] and [0096]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention

to incorporate the method of Ryan with the method of the modified HTML in order to

provide information that is of a geographical division of interest to the user.

As per claim 11, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser

executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising transmitting a result of

the parsing to a server along with an indication of the geographical location, selecting

content in conformity with the geographical location and the result of the parsing, and

pushing the selected content from the server, whereby the displaying displays the

pushed content selected in conformity with the geographical location (Ryan: paragraph

[0133]).

Claims 21 and 32 individually are similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore

rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection except for the following:

Applicant argued:

HTML does not disclose the comparing of the target to the list, and Bates does not disclose activating a secondary browser window in response to determining that the target is a sanctioned website.

The Office disagrees for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). HTML teaches parsing the detected activity to determine a target of said detected activity to activate a secondary browser window and display content associated with the target in the secondary browser window (pages 94 and 356; *following the detected user clicking of a hyperlink, detecting a tag for activating a secondary browser window and displaying content associated with the target in the secondary browser window via parsing*). The teaching extracted from Bates is for the feature of comparing the target to determine whether the target is in a list of pre-selected targets to displaying content associated with the target in the browser window (paragraphs [0129]-[0131])

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §
706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR
1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571)
272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to
3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

lvn
Patent Examiner
October 25, 2007